



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/538,431	03/29/2000	Baiju D. Mandalia	BOC9-1999-0056-US1	7538
23334	7590	08/18/2004	EXAMINER	
FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI & BIANCO P.L. ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER 551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111 BOCA RATON, FL 33487			GRANT II, JEROME	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2626	DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004	

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/538,431	MANDALIA
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jerome Grant II	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

JEROME GRANT II
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

1.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The written specification does not provide enough support making a speech to text conversion. It is assumed that this limitation is well known in the art.

2.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Serbinis.

With respect to claim 1, Serbinis teaches a method for managing documents (1-n) in a client server system comprising:

Coupling to a server system 17 with a database (25) , one or more client systems (10, 11) over a network 15; linking the server to a telephone system (via load balance 45) ; receiving (from a computer 10, 11) at least one identifier (according to col. 7, line 27) over the telephone system for a document to be stored (according to col. 8, lines 17-30 and see also item 61 of figure 2) from a user's fax machine (col. 7, lines 58-65, teaches utilization of system in an environment) in the database; receiving fax reception over the telephone system from at least one user's fax machine of at least one document corresponding to an identifier; and storing the fax data with the identifier in the database, as discussed at col. 8, lines 12-25 and 48-52.

With respect to claim 2, Serbinis teaches receiving a search request (when user through web browser causes server computer 20 to look up data stored in data base 25 for at least one identifier of at least one document from at least one or the clients (users 10 and 11) , see also col. 5 line 63 to col. 6, line 7. Serbinis teaches searching the database (server computer 20) based upon the search request received (computer 10, 11 gets information from the database 25); and presents the results 9 as taught at col. 10, lines 27-33) of the search of the database to clients on the network (Internet 15).

With respect to claim 3, Serbinis teaches receiving a selection from the clients over the network, according to col. 10, lines 27-33; presenting an image of the document store in the database 25 over the network 15 to the at least one of the one or more clients wherein the image corresponds to the selection of the search results, i.e., when the

user is granted access to files according to the search results of having search criteria set forth in col. 7, lines 24-35.

With respect to claim 4, Serbinis teaches receiving a selection (via server computer 20) to one or more clients 10, 11) over the network 15; presenting the image over the network to one or clients according to the search. See col. 10, lines 27-32 and reviewed on an image screen over a network 15 from database 25.

With respect to claim 5, Serbinis teaches a fax machine for receiving data. Note, data sent to fax machine is anticipated by col. 7, lines 59-65.

With respect to claim 6, Serbinis teaches a security identifier (see col. 7, lines 36-41) from a user of one or more clients; and wherein data is accessed only if the security identifier matches. See col. 7, lines 36-41 in combination with col. 10, lines 27-33 where access is granted when security information is successfully executed.

With respect to claim 7, Serbinis teaches the identifier is transmitted over a telephone network (15) for a document (1-n) where the system further includes a telephone key pad (on the computer 10 or 11) for selecting a category.

With respect to claim 8, Serbinis teaches managing documents (see figure 1a) wherein the step of receiving at least one identifier (col 7, lines 7) over a telephone line (15) for a document (1-n) includes voice response (see col. 7, lines 60-62) where voice activation is contemplated.

With respect to claim 9, Serbinis teaches where the network is the Internet (15), see figure 1a.

With respect to claim 10, Serbinis teaches managing documents including the steps of coupling (via load balance 45) a server system with a database 25 to a telephone system 15; receiving an identifier (col. 7, lines 27) in the database; receiving fax reception over the telephone system from at least one user's fax machine of at least one document corresponding to an identifier; and storing the fax data with the identifier in the database, as discussed at col. 8, lines 12-25 and 48-52.

With respect to claim 11, Serbinis teaches receiving a search request (when user through web browser causes server computer 20 to look up data stored in data base 25 for at least one identifier of at least one document from at least one or the clients (users 10 and 11), see also col. 5 line 63 to col. 6, line 7. Serbinis teaches searching the database (server computer 20) based upon the search request received (computer 10, 11 gets information from the database 25); and presents the results 9 as taught at col. 10, lines 27-33) of the search of the database to clients on the network (Internet 15).

With respect to claim 12, Serbinis teaches coupling to a server system 17 with a database (25) , one or more client systems (10, 11) over a network 15; linking the server to a telephone system (via load balance 45) ; receiving (from a computer 10, 11) at least one identifier (according to col. 7, line 27) over the telephone system for a document to be stored (according to col. 8, lines 17-30 and see also item 61 of figure 2) ; using voice response systems over the client network, see col. 7, lines 60-62; determining if the user has an account over the network (see col. 7, lines 24-35 for determining user account information; using the voice response system prompting the user to a category to associated with the document (anticipated from voice prompt according to col. 7, lines 60-62, see also col. 6, lines 54-57); and receiving a fax (over the Internet to server computer 20) to be stored in the database.

With respect to claim 13, Serbinis teaches receiving a search request (when user through web browser causes server computer 20 to look up data stored in data base 25 for at least one identifier of at least one document from at least one of the clients (users 10 and 11) , see also col. 5 line 63 to col. 6, line 7. Serbinis teaches searching the database (server computer 20) based upon the search request received (computer 10, 11 gets information from the database 25); and presents the results 9 as taught at col. 10, lines 27-33) of the search of the database to clients on the network (Internet 15).

With respect to claim 14, Serbinis teaches a computer readable medium (software , according to col. 6, lines 35-37 and 54-55) containing instructions comprising: coupling to a server system 17 with a database (25) , one or more client systems (10, 11) over a network 15; receiving (from a computer 10, 11) at least one identifier (according to col. 7, line 27) over the telephone system for a document to be stored (accoding to col. 8, lines 17-30 and see also item 61 of figure 2) from a user's fax machine (col. 7, lines 58-65, teaches utilization of system in an environment) in the database; receiving fax reception over the telephone system from at least one user's fax machine of at least one document corresponding to an identifier; and storing the fax data with the identifier in the database, as discussed at col. 8, lines 12-25 and 48-52.

With respect to claim 15, Serbinis teaches receiving a search request (when user through web browser causes server computer 20 to look up data stored in data base 25 for at lest one identifier of at least one document from at lest one or the clients (users 10 and 11) , see also col. 5 line 63 to col. 6, line 7. Serbinis teaches searching the database (server computer 20) based upon the search request received (computer 10, 11 gets information from the database 25); and presents the results 9 as taught at col. 10, lines 27-33) of the search of the database to clients on the network (Internet 15).

With respect to claim 16, Serbinis teaches a central fax storage and retrieval system according to col. 7, lines 58-61 which anticipates utilization in a fax environment, over a telephone network 15; a server 17 coupled to the network; a fax

receiver (computer 20) coupled to the server 17 for receiving faxes sent from a user's fax machine (information from recipients 10 and 11) which could use fax to e-mail conversion on computer s 10 and 11); telephone response system with voice recognition software, see col. 7, lines 60-62 and col. 6, lines 54-57 and identifying the user, see col. 7, lines 27-42; database 25 coupled to the server 17 for storing faxes.

With respect to claim 17, Serbinis teaches identifying a user using voice recognition, according to col. 7, lines 60-62 and col. 6, lines 54-57.

3.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serbinis in view of subject matter well known in the art (Official Notice).

Serbinis teaches all of the subject matter upon which the claims depend, except that there is no discussion regarding speech to text conversions. However, this limitation is well known in the art which is known to be used for the hearing impaired. Furthermore, applicant's lack of relevant discussion in the written specification seems to alleged that the limitation is contemplated by one of ordinary skill in the art.

4.

Examiner's Response

With respect to applicant's arguments regarding the 112 rejection to claim 18, the examiner construes applicant's arguments to be that applicant concedes that conversion from speech to text is not specifically mentioned using these words (ipsis verbis), and according to the last line of page 10 of the arguments, the conversion from speech to text is well known in the art. Furthermore, applicant argues at pages 11 and 12 different voice or speech recognition teachings but, these arguments and the subject matter in support thereof does not address the issue of speech to text conversion. Hence, the examiner concludes that speech to text, at least in context of this invention, was known to one in the art.

Applicant argues at the bottom of page 12 and the top of page 13 that Serbinis is directed toward a notification from a document management system and not a fax reception to the document management.

Applicant seems to suggest that the claim refers to directly or indirectly that notification is given from a fax reception to a document management system. However, this specific language is not suggested by claim 1. There is no language addressing "notification" nor a "management system". It is not clear why applicant is arguing limitations which are not supported in claim 1.

At the top of page 14, applicant argues that Serbinis is not applicable to the claimed feature for the reason that the notification of users by fax from the DMS is not the same as receiving a document to be stored by fax. While applicant's statement logically is true, namely that a notification of fax reception does not mean that there may be actual facsimile reception of a document. However, applicant's argument is not believed to be correct in view of Serbinis and by what is known in the prior art.

At col. 7, lines 59-64, the administration table 64 maintains information necessary to generate a notification message and include entries for facsimile. For the management system to include an entry from a facsimile, it must be capable and operatively connected to a facsimile machine. At col. 7, lines 9-23, table 64 includes information regarding documents stored in memory 30. Col. 8, lines 48-57 refer to the actual document themselves. Because Serbinis suggest that present invention works in a facsimile environment it can be deduced that notification of a reception of a document is at least taught with respect to the management data tables 61-64 for example, that keep statistics and other document information regarding the received document. Furthermore, although the examiner is not relying on other prior art as a basis for this rejection, Mandalia (US Pat. No. 5,907,598) which applicant has made as part of an IDS, teaches a fax connected over the Internet. Thus, if applicant still contends that Serbinis is not directed to reception of a document over a fax transmission, which the Examiner respectfully disagrees, Mandalia shows in figure 1 the fax reception over the

Internet which is similarly shown by figure 1a of Serbinis. Hence, what may be in doubt in view of the applicant is at least elucidated by Mandalia although Serbinis is sufficient.

Regarding the rejection of claims under 102(b), the applicant contends that Serbinis does not teach receiving a fax reception nor storing a fax reception. The examiner contends that Serbinis receives a fax reception by means of DMS system 17 and stores the fax reception in memory 30.

Regarding the 103 rejection of claim 18, the examiner maintains this rejection on the grounds that the speech to text limitations is not set forth in the written description of the application and that applicant's arguments are construed as this limitation being known in the prior art.

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Grant II whose telephone number is 703-305-4391. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams, can be reached on (703) 305-4863. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

J. Grant II
JEROME GRANT II
PRIMARY EXAMINER